

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Cordell et al does not teach the instant invention substantially as claimed.

Among other inventive components in the instant invention, Cordell et al does not teach a plurality of individual modular cells that are individually controlled burn regions.

The examiner recognizes this lack of teaching and cites Williams et al to try to fill in the missing information stating that "...Williams is composed of honeycomb ceramic segments which obviously function equivalently to applicant's modular cells. The grate of Cordell et al. is segmented and to replace the grate with the honeycomb grate of Williams et al renders applicants' gasifier including a plurality of individual modular cells lined with refractory obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art."

The Examiner is absolutely wrong in this position. Even if the ceramic segments function equivalently to applicants' modular cells, which they do not, there is absolutely nothing in Williams et al that teaches individual segments that function as individually controlled burn regions.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to positively enforce this aspect of the inventive device.

Further, since the instant claim 1 is limited to a height to diameter ratio of at least 1 to 2 for the gasifier, it is not clear to the applicant how the monstrous device of Williams et al, with all of the mechanical equipment could fit into a gasifier that meets this limitation, and therefore, how such a combination of references could teach or make obvious the instant invention.

On the basis of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove the rejection and allow the claims to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. McKellar
Reg. No. 26,002
(989) 631-4551